



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

and he has no excuse. Insolvency justifies refusal of credit and an assumption that the contract will not be carried out. *Ex parte Chalmers*, L. R. 8 Ch. 289. Consequently, the evidence in the principal case should be admitted unless the plaintiff shows he would have given notification of his intention and ability to buy for cash, but was misled because the defendant did not base his rescission on insolvency.

**CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE — DIVISION OF DAMAGES BETWEEN NEGLIGENT VESSELS.** — An action was brought in a state court for damages caused to the plaintiff's vessel by a collision with the defendant's vessel, due to the negligence of both. *Held*, that the plaintiff may recover one-half of the loss suffered. *St. Louis & Tennessee River Packet Co. v. Murray*, 139 S. W. 1078 (Ky.).

Heretofore, if a plaintiff has brought his action in a state court for negligent injury to a vessel by collision, the common-law rule has been applied that if he is negligent he cannot recover. *New York Harbor Towboat Co. v. New York, etc. Ry. Co.*, 148 N. Y. 574, 42 N. E. 1086. See *Union Steamship Co. v. Nottinghams*, 17 Grat. (Va.) 115, 123. An early Louisiana case stated that if both vessels were at fault the loss should be divided. *Brickell v. Frisby*, 2 Rob. (La.) 204. Later cases in that state refuse to apply this rule. *Murphy v. Diamond*, 3 La. Ann. 441. Except for the Louisiana case, the principal case is the only instance of an action in a state court where the admiralty rule of damages has been applied. It directly overrules an earlier Kentucky decision. *Broadwell v. Swigert*, 7 B. Mon. (Ky.) 39.

**CRIMINAL LAW — APPEAL — PRESUMPTION AS TO HARMLESS ERROR.** — At the trial of the defendant for perjury a question was submitted to the jury which the court should have decided. The defendant was convicted. *Held*, that to secure a reversal the defendant must show that the error was prejudicial to him. *Coleman v. State*, 118 Pac. 594 (Okl.).

Several jurisdictions have the rule that if the error might have prejudiced the rights of the defendant, there must be a reversal. *Boyd v. State*, 16 Lea (Tenn.) 149. See *Boren v. State*, 32 Tex. Cr. R. 637, 645, 25 S. W. 775, 776. Others hold that if there was error it is presumed prejudicial to the defendant, and unless this presumption is rebutted, a reversal must follow. *Barnett v. Commonwealth*, 84 Ky. 449, 1 S. W. 722; *State v. Johnson*, 69 Ia. 623, 29 N. W. 754. The principal case holds that a defendant must show the appellate court that the error prejudiced his rights in order to secure a reversal. This rule is the best, and has the support of advanced thinkers on criminal procedure. See 35 REPORTS OF AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, 624 *et seq.* A recent amendment to the Constitution of California, proposed by the legislature, provides that there shall be no reversal in a criminal case unless the court believes the error has resulted in a miscarriage of justice. CAL. STAT. OF 1911, 1798, c. 36.

**CRIMINAL LAW — INSANITY — BURDEN OF PROOF.** — In a trial for murder the defendant introduced evidence of insanity. *Held*, that the burden is upon the prosecution to prove sanity beyond a reasonable doubt. *Adair v. State*, 118 Pac. 416 (Okl.).

The principal case is correct in holding that insanity is a question of responsibility, and not an affirmative defense, the presumption of sanity placing the burden of going forward upon the defendant but not relieving the prosecution of its duty of proving all essential elements of the offense. For the authorities and principles involved, see 4 HARV. L. REV. 45, 55; 11 *id.* 62; 13 *id.* 59; 18 *id.* 312.

**DAMAGES — CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES — RECOVERY FOR MENTAL ANGUISH CAUSED BY BREACH OF CONTRACT.** — The plaintiff bought a ticket for